

Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gedjenson
Gekas
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodling
Gordon
Granger
Green
Gutierrez
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefner
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly

Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)

Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NAYS—167

Aderholt
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehner
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Crapo
Cunningham

Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Everett
Ewing
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler

Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kennelly
Kingston
Klug
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup

Norwood
Nussle
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers

Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump

Sununu
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Ackerman
Clay
Coburn
Cubin
Fawell
Flake
Foglietta
Gephardt
Gonzalez

Hall (OH)
Hinojosa
King (NY)
Lewis (CA)
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Menendez
Payne

Riley
Schiff
Scott
Shuster
Waxman
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2322

Messrs. RYUN, SNOWBARGER, VIS-
CLOSKY, and PICKERING and Mrs.
NORTHUP changed their vote from
“yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not having voted in
favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

IN SUPPORT OF THE MARRIAGE
TAX ELIMINATION ACT

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given
permission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend his re-
marks and include extraneous mate-
rial.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today in support of the Marriage Tax
Elimination Act. I would like to speak
in favor of this important legislation
with a few simple questions.

Mr. Speaker, do Americans feel it is
fair that our Tax Code imposes a high-
er tax penalty on marriage? Do Ameri-
cans feel that it is fair that 21 million
middle-class married working couples
pay an average of almost \$1,400 in high-
er taxes just because they are married?
Do Americans feel it is morally right
that our Tax Code provides an incen-
tive to get divorced?

Of course not. The marriage tax is
not only unfair, it is wrong. It is im-
moral that our Tax Code punishes our
society's most basic institution, mar-
riage, with a tax penalty of almost
\$1,400 for 21 million working couples.
The Marriage Tax Elimination Act
eliminates the marriage penalty. It is
important legislation that deserves bi-
partisan support. I am pleased we now
have 223 cosponsors to eliminate the
marriage tax penalty.

I include the following material for
the RECORD:

MARRIAGE TAX QUOTES

If we are really interested in “putting chil-
dren first”, then why would this country pe-
nalize the very situation (marriage) where

kids do best? When parents are truly com-
mitted to each other, through their marriage
vows, their children's outcomes are en-
hanced. Children from solid, married fami-
lies have higher graduation rates from high
school and lower rates of drug abuse and
teenage pregnancy.—Gary & Carla Gipson of
Houston, Texas.

I am a 61 year old grandmother, still hold-
ing down a full time job, and I remarried
three years ago. I had to think long and hard
about marriage over staying single as I knew
it would cost us several thousand dollars a
year just to sign that marriage license. Mar-
riage has become a contract between two in-
dividuals and the federal government.—Mary
A. Hottel of New Castle, Virginia.

Last, I would like to share the few simple
words spoken by a constituent of mine in Illi-
nois' 11th Congressional District:

You try and be honest and do things
straight, and you get penalized for it. That's
just not right.—Mike Reading—Monee, Illi-
nois.

[From the Daily Journal, Sept. 11, 1997]

THE MARRIAGE TAX

Congressman Jerry Weller is taking a lead-
ing part in the campaign to repeal the mar-
riage tax.

A story in The Daily Journal Wednesday
reported that both he and Rep. David Mac-
Intosh of Indiana are spearheading an effort
to get the tax repealed. They would like to
see its repeal as part of any new tax bill next
year.

We agree. The marriage tax is an unfair
imposition. The code should be rewritten to
eliminate it.

While we are all for simplicity in the tax
code, the reality is that taxes drive social
engineering. People will do anything, almost
anything, that's legal to avoid taxes. Thus,
throughout the 1980s, depreciation rules
drove the construction, even overbuilding, in
many areas of the country. Large portions of
the health insurance crises were driven by a
change in the tax laws. You used to be able
to deduct insurance entirely off your income
tax. It should not have surprised lawmakers
that the percentage of people taking health
insurance dropped when the deductibility of
health insurance shrank.

Thus, laws should encourage, rather than
discourage, marriage. And they should en-
courage, rather than discourage, couples
from staying together.

It is patently unfair that a married couple,
where both work, is taxed at a higher rate
than two separate people. Every year you
hear of a couple that humorously goes
through a sham divorce just for tax pur-
poses.

This year, the government did lurch in the
right direction by enacting tax credits to
help parents. Now it should act to help the
rest of the family by repealing the marriage
tax. Weller's initiative deserves support.

[From the Herald News, Oct. 16, 1997]

WORKING FAMILIES WELCOME REPEAL OF
MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

Elimination of the marriage tax penalty
looks like a “can't miss” campaign for mar-
ried couples and Rep. Jerry Weller, R-Morris.

The problem is that it has failed in the
past, most notably it was part of the recent
Republican “Contract with America.” It has
been vetoed twice by President Bill Clinton.

Backing this tax reform is like supporting
hot dogs and apple pie. It's “politically cor-
rect.”

Weller's bill would allow married couples
to select “single” or “married” on their In-
ternal Revenue Service forms. They can pick
the filing status that brings them the great-
est tax relief.

Like any "relief," this proposal has a price tag. More than 21 million married couples pay an average of \$1,400 more in taxes because they file joint income tax returns.

Weller has 218 co-sponsors for this legislation so far. That's a majority in the House of Representatives. The key player in his corner is House Speaker Newt Gingrich, R-Ga. Gingrich said that an anticipated budget surplus next spring could be used to offset the loss of revenue caused by the eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Even a heavyweight like Gingrich will face opposition with this unfair tax. There are numerous other uses for that projected surplus, including legislators who want to spend more to repair the nation's highways.

All of this considered, the elimination of the marriage tax should have appeal for working families. Weller said the tax change would be the centerpiece of any 1998 tax relief bills.

Working couples should support this concept. The tax is clearly discriminatory.

Weller released the results of a national poll this week that showed Americans support repeal of the marriage tax. We are sure of that. This is a middle class issue that will draw considerable support when it is explained to taxpayers.

Taxpayers across America should support repeal of the marriage tax. In this region that means contacting Weller's office or Rep. Harris Fawell of Naperville. It will bring clear-cut tax relief to married couples. There may be competition to use federal dollars for other purposes but working people need to stand up and be counted on this proposal.

Marriage should not be penalized by the IRS.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SAXTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HUMAN RIGHTS IN ECUADOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about human rights in Ecuador.

On October 1, I traveled to Ecuador to visit several American prisoners who have been held for many years without even a trial. I made my first trip to Ecuador in April of this year, where I was surprised to see the horrible conditions of the prison and the chaotic condition that exists in the justice system.

Ecuador is a Third World country that cannot afford decent prisons. Many prisoners do not even have bathrooms or food that is safe to eat. The justice system is incredibly corrupt.

Judges and lawyers ask for bribes, and it is only the wealthy who can buy their way out. Almost 80 percent of the prisoners in this country have been held on drug charges. Because Ecuador has some of the strictest drug laws in the world, I have been told by several officials that this policy is a result of pressure from the United States.

I firmly believe that we need to be tough on crime. But the problem in Ecuador is that the drug laws are so sophisticated that you have to have a good functional justice system to administer these laws. Ecuador does not. There is no computers in the courtroom. It takes months before the police even let the courts know that someone has been arrested. And then you can sit in jail for years before anyone acknowledges you.

The problem is that when, and if, the people go to trial, more than 60 percent of them are found innocent. Let me repeat this. Sixty percent of those people are found innocent. This is a travesty. And in this system, there are almost 60 Americans. But there has been progress. The condemnation of international attention and visits by Members of Congress in this part of the country has shed light on the situation. I am proud today that since April, Ecuador has released more than 800 Ecuadorean prisoners who were trapped in this unjust system.

One of those prisoners was an American who was released last month after my visit. I spoke about this woman when I came to the floor in May to talk about the problems of this horrible system. Her name is Sandra Chase. She is a 53-year-old woman who suffers a terrible circulatory disease. She was arrested in December 1995 during her first trip out of this country. It took almost 18 months for the police to take her deposition. While she was in jail, Sandra lost her house and everything she owned.

On October 7, the Ecuadorean Government gave amnesty to Sandra Chase. She came home October 9, and her daughter Tammi and I met her in Miami.

□ 2330

She is now with her daughter in California where she is receiving treatment for her disease. I cannot express how happy I was that after almost 2 years, Sandra Chase was able to come home to her family. What a terrible nightmare she suffered.

I am submitting a letter for the RECORD that I have sent to the Minister of Government in Ecuador thanking their country for their release of this prisoner.

While I am extremely grateful for the cooperation, I remain very concerned about another prisoner in Ecuador, Jim Williams. He has been held for 14 months, and the judge in this case continues to refuse all of the evidence presented on his behalf. This is a very good example of how the justice system does not work.

Jim Williams has brought an incredible amount of attention to the justice system in Ecuador and has helped many lives by doing so. I continue to pray for Jim Williams and his family. This Sunday night, November 9, Jim Williams and other American prisoners in Ecuador will be featured on 60 Minutes. I hope that this program will show the American people what is happening to our neighbors in South America and encourage this country to take a closer look at our policy in South America.

Finally, I want to thank the family of Jim Williams for their continued strong support. My thoughts and prayers go out to each of them, especially to Jim Williams' mother, who sends me cards of encouragement, and to Jim Williams' loving wife Robin Williams, who have worked campaigning for her husband each day since his arrest, and his brother Charlie Williams who refused to give up the fight. Robin and Charles are in Washington tonight working on behalf of Jim Williams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. REDMOND]. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McNULTY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. McNULTY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RUSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule 11 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit the Rules of Procedure of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.